SDS
Prog.Ev.
1980(02)

PROGRAM EVALUATION
ÉVALUATION des PROGRAMMES

KATIMAVIK

REVIEW

REVIEW OF KATIMAVIK

AND ITS EVALUATIONS

Program Evaluation Directorate
Evaluation, Audit and Planning
Coordination Branch
Secretary of State

October 16, 1980

REVIEW OF KATIMAVIK AND ITS EVALUATIONS

Executive Summary

The purpose of this review is to contribute to an informed decision on future funding of Katimavik, particularly the funding of Year V (April 1981 to September 1982).

Directed by a not-for-profit corporation, Katimavik is a national youth program allowing for voluntary service in rural communities, the personal development of Canadian youth, the use of conserver technologies, and an increased understanding of Canada's diversity. Annually, about 1100 youth spend nine months on work projects and in self-managed group life.

Past evaluations, in 1978 by the Treasury Board and in 1979 by the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, have not given unequivocal and mutually-supportive evidence on the success of Katimavik in respect to its several objectives. Together, the studies tend to support continued funding of Katimavik. However, since the studies were neither exhaustive nor based upon current information, a more definitive response requires an evaluation study carried out with considerable advance planning.

Program Evaluation Directorate

Department of the Secretary of State

October 16, 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page:
1.	Purpose of this Report	1
2.	History of Katimavik	1
3.	Nature and Operations	2
4.	Objectives of Katimavik and Their Meaning	6
5.	Past Evaluations	9
	5.1 The 1978 Evaluation by Treasury Board	10
	5.2 The 1979 Evaluation by Canada Employment and Immigration Commission	13
6.	Conclusion	15

REVIEW OF KATIMAVIK

AND ITS EVALUATIONS

1. Purpose of this Report

The present report serves an immediate and important need: to make an informed decision on whether to fund Year V of Katimavik (April 1981 to September 1982). This report provides a basic description of the program and a review of objectives and past evaluations.

2. History of Katimavik

Katimavik, an Inuit word for "meeting place", is a national youth volunteer service and development program operated by a non-profit corporation, now funded by the Department of the Secretary of State. Early in 1977, OPCAN was created to direct a program enabling young Canadian adults of ages 17 to 21 years to live and work together for about nine months in three different regions of the country while furthering their personal development and

knowledge of the country in service of their fellow Canadians. Prominent Canadians serve on a voluntary basis as Members of the OPCAN Board.

Information deleted pursuant to 69(1)(g) Access to Information Act
Renseignements supprimés en vertu de 69(1)(g) la Loi sur l'accès à l'information

On the basis of subsequent status reports and the Treasury Board evaluation, the program received support in principle for a further three-year period to 1981-82 but support in actual funds only for the first of those three years.

In 1979, during the change in government, the program experienced delays and near termination. However, all staff remained through the uncertainty. During that year the responsibility for Katimavik was shifted to CEIC and a further evaluation was instituted. In June of 1979 the program was moved to the Department of the Secretary of State. It experienced further delays in funding resulting in the late start of Year IV.

3. Nature and Operations

Katimavik is a rather complex "meeting place". It seeks to gather a variety of participants into a microcosm of Canadian society. Participants are selected from a bank of applicants. They are selected at random to fill quotas defined by several socio-demographic criteria: official language,

gender, province of permanent residence, family income, and size of home community. Those selected are allocated to groups of 33 persons according to fixed ratios for these criteria. During their stay of nine months, the participant groups are rotated through three-month projects in each of three different regions of Canada. One of the project locations is in a community speaking the other official language.

Katimavik provides an occasion for the meeting of many kinds of people. Youthful participants meet each other; the two language communities meet; participants meet sponsors; participants meet and live with host families on each project site; participants meet voluntary agencies and usually their clientele. Katimavik also provides another opportunity for local community people to meet each other.

Katimavik has now entered Year IV. In the three previous years, it provided its integrated living experience: (1)for 1036 participants on 31 projects in Year I; (2)for 1287 participants on 39 projects in Year II; and (3)for 1386 participants on 42 projects in Year III. The fourth year, at time of writing, has selected 1089 participants for 33 projects. Each year sees a fairly large attrition rate and projects often finish with somewhat less than 33 persons. Table 1 presents some basic information about participation levels and attrition rates.

.../4

TABLE 1. KATIMAVIK FACT SHEET

	PROGRAM YEAR			
	YEAR ONE	YEAR TWO	YEAR THREE	YEAR FOUR
OPCAN Year	3/77-9/78	3/78-9/79	5/79-9/80	5/80-9/81
1. Program Operations Year:	8/77-7/78	7/78-5/79	6/79-5/80	9/80-7/81
2. Budget:	$10.0M	$10.5M	$11.2M	$12.1M
3. Expended:	$8.4M	$9.1M	$10.6M	N.A.
4. Number of OPCAN Staff:	50	50	58	55
5. Number of Program Field Staff:	120	148	156	120
6. Field Staff Attrition Rate:	50%	53%	30%	N.A.
7. Number of Projects:	31	39	42	33
(Military Option):	(1)	(2)	(3)	(3)
8. Number of Communities:	46	63	87	78
9. Average Budget per Project:	$180K	$200K	$181K	$210K
10. Number of Inquiries:	3,500	3,500	12,192	12,712
11. Number of Applicants:	3,500	3,184	1,861	2,103
12. Number of Participants:	30/project	33/project	33/project	33/project
- at start:	1,036	1,287	1,386	1,089
- at finish:	818	978	1,045	N.A.
13. Attrition Rate:	21.0%	24.0%	24.6%	N.A.

The Katimavik program cycle begins with discussions between OPCAN regional staff and interested local community leaders and sponsors in order to devise appropriate projects. Once determined and fitted into a national overall scheme, each project is planned in detail by its field staff unit of four persons: three group leaders and one coordinator. On site for about two and one-half months in advance of participants, these units plan and arrange for all of the contingencies related to the arrival of the many youth who will live and work there. This planning includes lodging, food, transportation, insurance, billeting with local families, social activities, work supervision, materials, tools and equipment - to mention only the major tasks. The field staff are assisted in their planning exercises at the regional staff training sessions. The units then proceed to a national training session of about ten days during which they meet with the other two units in their rotation and coordinate plans. From there the field staff return to their sites and prepare for the participants and the participant orientation sessions on site. Work and leisure activities then proceed apace, including billeting with community families. After three months, the group of 33 participants vacates the premises for the second group and travels to another region. In this manner, three groups of 33 rotate through a common set of three unique projects.

Projects and project budgets are developed by the field staff and regional staff. The national staff set policy and guidelines, guide the budgetary

.../6

process, receive participant applications, allocate selected participants to groups, train field staff, and coordinate project selection and the rotational system. The national staff also organize the massive travel arrangements before, during and after project activity.

In respect to staff and participants, Katimavik maintains a salaried permanent staff of about 50-55 persons, the majority of whom work out of the five regional offices. The program annually hires some 130-150 temporary field staff - the project coordinators and group leaders. Although not salaried, the 1100-1200 participants receive $1.00 per day while on site and $1,000 upon completion of the period of nine months. The latter sum is pro-rated where participants drop-out of the projects.

Except for an inflation factor, Katimavik funding has remained unchanged over four years of operation. Year I saw a budget of $10 million and an actual expenditure of $8.4 million. Year II witnessed an expenditure of $9.1 million from a budget of $10.5 million. In Year III and out of a budget of $11.2 million, the program expended $10.6 million. For the current year, Katimavik has been promised $12.1 million through a contribution arrangement with Secretary of State.

4. Objectives of Katimavik and Their Meaning .

The objectives of Katimavik as taken from the Agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and OPCAN dated June 20, 1980 are quoted below:

4.1 Service to Society: to make a lasting and relevant contribution to the host community, and more broadly to society at large, by:

4.1.1 the implementation of projects of benefit and interest to the host community and to the region;

4.1.2 participation in community association and volunteer community activities at the request of these associations;

4.1.3 the commitment to a sustained and demanding physical and intellectual effort;

4.1.4 optional participation with the Canadian Armed Forces; and

4.1.5 the general contribution to society of young adults who have gained an increased awareness of the problems of society, contributed to the solution of these problems and developed a sense of continuing commitment to working for the benefit of others.

4.2 Personal Development: to develop as fully as possible the potential in each participant in order to enhance his own well-being and to contribute most usefully to the well-being of others by:

4.2.1 testing and developing attributes of physical fitness, self-awareness and self-sufficiency;

4.2.2 developing skills;

.../8

4.2.3 expanding knowledge of topical issues; and

4.2.4 living and working as a team and developing:

4.2.4.1 a sense of solidarity and team spirit,

4.2.4.2 a capacity for greater autonomy within a group as well as a sense of personal and collective discipline, and

4.2.4.3 a capacity of self-management.

4.3 (To) prepare (for) and contribute to conservation and harmonious development in a society of scarce resources by:

4.3.1 achieving the greatest possible degree of autonomy and self-sufficiency in the basic functions of lodging, food and energy through the utilization of available local resources;

4.3.2 the actual and useful application of conservation techniques, the use of appropriate technology, the harmonious utilization of available resources; and

4.3.3 sensitization to the world-wide problems of resource scarcity, environment protection and harmonious development.

4.4 (To increase) knowledge and understanding of the country and of its diversity by:

4.4.1 living and participating in teams composed of participants from all regions and all walks of life;

4.4.2 developing an awareness and understanding of the communities in which they will be living;

4.4.3 living in three different regions of the country;

4.4.4 acquiring a working knowledge of the other official language; and

4.4.5 experience with the Armed Forces (for a restricted number of participants).

A point to consider when faced with this long list of objectives is whether there is some inherent logical hierarchy. Katimavik presents the observer with an indivisible integrated package. Not only is there no priority among the objectives, but they interrelate in a wholistic pattern. For example, the development of persons certainly is a benefit to society, a lasting contribution. Equally, increased awareness of the "musts" of the impending conserver society, disseminated through the "new youth" sent out, is a service to society which according to all predictions will need model conservers.

5. Past Evaluations

Only two evaluations are available. Both were conducted in the early years of the program. Neither was comprehensive in its approach. They are summarized in Table 2 and briefly described in the next two sections.

.../10

5.1 The 1978 Evaluation By Treasury Board

The Treasury Board contracted an evaluation of Katimavik in the fall of 1978 when Year II was just underway. The study dealt with five general areas: the reactions of participants, of communities, and of sponsors; an assessment of language proficiency; and an analysis of costs.

Since Katimavik had been planned to fulfill four goals, the extent to which these goals were attained was assessed for the first year of operation and for part of the second year through questionnaires sent to the participants, host community leaders, and sponsors. Generally, the participants were somewhat negative while the latter two expressed generally positive comments.

From the points of view of all concerned, service to society probably was the best achieved objective. In most projects, there were more participants who were happy about their work achievement than participants who were unhappy. Of the sponsors, 91% were satisfied with the work done and so were 92% of the community leaders.

Two aspects of personal development were assessed: physical development and group life. The first aspect was rated overall as "bad" to "mediocre" by the participants while the second was barely acceptable.

.../11

Table 2. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

Item:	1978 TB	1979 CEIC
Program year	First year and first portion of second year.	First two years.
Respondents	(70%) Participants, (119/250) host community leaders, and (18/30) sponsors.	104 persons from each year; half were participants, half were unsuccessful participants
Methodology	Questionnaires, interviews.	Telephone survey and application form data.
Achievement of Objectives	The participants were generally negative in their assessment; the other respondents were generally positive. The best achieved objective was service to society. All others were rated poorly achieved or not achieved.	The overall rating by participants was extremely high.
Additional Points		Year I participants criticized project planning. Participants more likely to be back in school than other applicants. No evidence of enhanced employability.
Summary	Generally negative.	Largely positive.

No objective assessment was made of acquired skills or of the sense of personal and collective discipline which were presumed to develop. The comments of community leaders, sponsors and participants suggested that deficient field staff leadership precluded attainment of these goals.

The ecological and cultural objectives of the program were those which were the least well achieved. Participants considered their contribution to ecological matters to be mediocre. Lack of qualified resource personnel and poor planning appeared to have been responsible for this failure - mainly at the project site.

The cultural objectives of knowledge of the country and its diversity were achieved only to a "mediocre" degree. Participants reported difficulty integrating with their host community. With respect to language acquisition, most francophones but only about half of the anglophones benefitted from the opportunity to learn a second language, as demonstrated by a proficiency test.

It should be noted that for most of these objectives, there was progress as the groups went through their three projects. Furthermore, for all objectives there were some improvements from Year I to Year II, based on an assessment after Year II was a few months old.

.../13

Finally, in respect to the analysis of costs in Year I, it was tentatively concluded that Katimavik, in comparison with similar programs, was relatively costly: about $8,000 per participant of which about $4,000 went to the participant in food, lodging, pocket money and honorarium. However, program scope and duration were recognized as important factors to be considered in any final value judgement. The study concluded with a recommendation, among others, to consider distributing the funds to other similar programs.

5.2 The 1979 Evaluation by Canada Employment and Immigration Commission (CEIC)

When the responsibility for Katimavik was moved from the Treasury Board to CEIC in the fall of 1979 that Department, understandably, tried to determine if and how Katimavik fitted into its general thinking about youth employment and training programs. The government of the day had set its priorities on finding or creating meaningful jobs and on suitably training the many unemployed or unemployable youth. Although their study has here been labelled an evaluation, CEIC insisted in their final summary that the report on the survey did "not constitute an evaluation". Presumably the insistence alludes to the lack of total coverage of Katimavik in the report and to the particular interpretation given to some objectives: furthering understanding of Canada, enhancing personal well-being, and contributing to the well-being of others.

.../14

From each of the first two years of operation, the CEIC study drew a random sample of about 52 individuals who had completed the full program cycle and of about 52 individuals who had applied but not been selected. Their study compared the 104 unsuccessful applicants with the 104 participants. All 208 persons were asked certain questions in a telephone survey. Additional data were obtained from their application forms.

In respect to the Katimavik objectives, the overall rating of the program by participants was extremely high. Participants were able to clearly identify the Katimavik objectives and opined that the goals had been met. They felt they had furthered their knowledge of Canada, contributed to the well-being of others, learned new skills, gained and used new knowledge, and improved their own chances of getting a job. In respect to other areas, participants were more likely to be back in school than other applicants, although both groups chose work over school. Weak points were identified by participants such as poor project planning in Year I.

In respect to CEIC's concern for employability, as measured by actual time spent at work or in school, it was found that the participants and applicants did not differ appreciably.

.../15

6. Conclusion

This review of the two available evaluations does not provide an unequivocal answer to the question of whether to continue the funding of Katimavik. On balance, however, the findings are somewhat in favour of continuing the program. The study with the more positive conclusions included equal input from the first two years, whereas the more negative conclusions were based mainly on the first year. Neither study examined the full range of program objectives. Furthermore, no study has, to date, examined Katimavik in its present mature state. A more definitive response will require an evaluation study carried out with considerable advance planning.